Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic

Diagnostic Review Report

Time Period Report for May 29 st through June 3 rd , 2013					Confidence (to genus)			
Host		Diagnosis	eq	cted	ed	sive		
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive		
Allium sativum	Garlic	White Rot (Stromatinia (Sclerotium) cepivora (cepivorum))	1	0	0	0		
Poa & other spp.	Turfgrass, mixed spp.	European Crane Fly (<i>Tipula paludosa</i>)	0	0	1	0		
Poa & other spp.	Turfgrass, mixed spp.	Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0		
Picea abies nidiformis	Bird's Nest spruce	Cytospora Canker; Dieback (<i>Cytospora</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0		
Picea abies nidiformis	Bird's Nest spruce	Mechanical Damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0		
Picea abies nidiformis	Bird's Nest spruce	Wood Rot Fungus (<i>Stereum</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0		
Picea sp./spp.	Spruce	Sooty Mold (Unidentified Fungus)	1	0	0	0		
Picea sp./spp.	Spruce	Weir's Cushion Rust (<i>Chrysomyxa weirii</i>)	1	0	0	0		
Pieris japonica	Japanese Andromeda	Moisture Stress (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0		

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic

Diagnostic Review Report

Pieris japonica	Japanese Andromeda	Root Damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Pieris japonica	Japanese Andromeda	White Mold (<i>Sclerotinia</i> sp./spp.)	0	0	1	0
Quercus phellos	Willow Oak	Discula Anthracnose (<i>Discula</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Quercus phellos	Willow Oak	High pH Damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Tsuga canadensis	Eastern Hemlock	Hemlock Nalepellid Mite (<i>Nalepella tsugifoliae</i>)	0	0	1	0
Tsuga canadensis	Eastern Hemlock	Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
Tsuga canadensis	Eastern Hemlock	Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.